



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,503	12/13/2005	Hidekazu Inoue	69681.000005	4612
21967 7590 12/12/2008 HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 1900 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109				
EXAMINER				
MURRAY, JEFFREY H				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1624				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/12/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/560,503

Applicant(s)

INOUE ET AL.

Examiner

JEFFREY H. MURRAY

Art Unit

1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 November 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. After further consideration, the final rejection mailed on August 5, 2008 has been withdrawn. The following action is issued and replaces the non-final action dated August 5, 2008. The final rejection has been withdrawn from consideration. This action seeks to remedy examination of those claims.

This action is in response to an after-final amendment filed on November 5, 2008. There are eight claims pending and eight claims under consideration. This is the third action on the merits. The present invention relates to imidazotriazinone compounds, pharmaceutically acceptable salts and solvates thereof, having PDE 7 (phosphodiesterase VII) inhibiting effect. These compounds are effective compounds for treating various kinds of disease such as allergic disease, inflammatory disease and immunologic disease.

Withdrawn Rejections/Objections

2. Applicant is notified that any outstanding rejection/objection that is not expressly maintained in this office action has been withdrawn or rendered moot in view of applicant's amendments and/or remarks.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 7 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

Claim 7 fails to further limit claim 1. According to the restriction requirement, B is CH, so Claim 7 is merely restating the limitation found within the restriction requirement. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, 2nd paragraph

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. The scope of "heteroaryl" and "heterocycloalkyl" requires clarification. Applicants' examples in the specification are not limiting. Applicants have not defined these terms with reasonable clarity. See definitions on p.5 of the specification. Where applicants define terms with a special meaning, they must set out the special definition with "reasonable clarity, deliberateness and precision". Note *Teleflex v. Ficosa*, 63 USPQ2d 1374; *Rexnord Corp v. Laitram Corp.* 60 USPQ2d 1851 and MPEP 2111.01.

The terms are defined with non-limiting examples making them impossible to pin down. For example, when one states C₁-C₄ alkyl, there are a small finite number of possibilities that exist in that set. One ordinarily skilled in the art realizes and understands this. However when one states, "heterocycloalkyl" optionally substituted and then provides a list of several examples and states the list is non-limiting, how can this be considered definite? One skilled in the art could instantly envision well over one hundred 100 ring systems that qualify under this broad, vague definition. Does the applicant wish to claim a thiophene or a triazolopyrimidine? Applicant must narrow such broad terminology by either eliminating such a broad definition or by inserting the specific ring systems they wish to cover into the claim themselves. These arguments

also apply to definitions within the specification which contain these terms, such as "heterobicycloalkyl"

In addition, "optionally substituted" also falls under this same argument. In the absence of the specific moieties intended to effect modification by "substitution" or attachment to the chemical core claimed, the term "optionally substituted" renders the claim in which it appears indefinite in all occurrences where the applicant fails to articulate by chemical name, structural formula or sufficiently distinct functional language, the particular moieties applicant regards as those which will facilitate substitution, requisite to identifying the composition of matter claimed. See pages 5-6 of the specification. "Substituted" is a vague and indefinite term because there is no set of possibilities clearly defined in the claims and supported by the specification. This argument is applied to all examples such as "optionally substituted heteroaryl," whereby one skilled in the art would have no idea whatsoever what type of compound applicant was trying to claim with such ambiguous claim language. No new matter permitted. Appropriate correction is required.

Conclusion

6. Claims 1, 4-10 are rejected.
7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey H. Murray whose telephone number is 571-272-9023. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. 7:30-6pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisors, James O. Wilson can be reached at 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jeffrey H Murray/
Patent Examiner , Art Unit 1624

**/James O. Wilson/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1624**